

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/593,541	(06/14/2000	Stephen P. Forte	T7093.0004/P002	8074	
24998	7590	03/24/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 2101 L Street, NW				HONG, HARRY S		
Washington,		37		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2614		
				DATE MAILED: 03/24/2000	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/593,541	FORTE, STEPHEN P.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Harry S. Hong	2642	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet v	rith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC e, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 J	lanuarv 2006.		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		tters, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under			
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-60</u> is/are pending in the application	١.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-60</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 January 2000</u> is/are		objected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	·	•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigna) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
 Certified copies of the priority documen 	ts have been received.		
Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received in .	Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	-	າ received in this National Stage	
application from the International Burea			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies no	received.	
Attachmont(a)			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗀 latan iaw	Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of References Clied (PTO-692) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	(s)/Mail Date	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date) 5) Notice of 6) Other:	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/593,541 Page 2

Art Unit: 2642

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1-13, 37-41, and 46-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinard et al. (Pinard; US 5,454,032; previously cited and applied); Bannister et al. (Bannister; US 5,548,636; previously cited and applied); or Mukerjee et al. (Mukerjee; US 6,405,041; previously cited and applied) in view of Cripps (US 4,471,167; cited and applied for the first time).

The entire patent to Pinard or Bannister (column 11, line 45 – column 12, line 34) plainly teaches the claimed feature of selectively establishing communication with one of plural devices associated with single telephone number where Pinard or Bannister clearly teaches the claimed first network as a PBX network and the claimed second network as a public wireless carrier network.

Application/Control Number: 09/593,541

Art Unit: 2642

The entire patent to Mukerjee also plainly teaches the claimed feature of selectively establishing communication with one of plural devices associated with single telephone number where Mukerjee clearly teaches the claimed first network as a PBX network (140) and the claimed second network as a public wireless carrier network.

Pinard, Bannister, or Mukerjee differs from claims 1-13, 37-41, and 46-60 with respect to the physical connection to a physical extension. However, the entire patent to Cripps (refer *inter alia* to column 9 lines 6 – 66) is directed to plainly teaching the advantages of a direct physical connection to a physical extension for a wireless device without any changes to the central office. Therefore, it would have been obvious even to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the concept of the detecting a physical connection to a physical extension as taught by Cripps into the system of Pinard, Bannister, or Mukerjee in order to provide PSTN/PBX functionality to the wireless device with minimal modification.

4. Claims 14-36 and 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mauger et al. (Mauger; US 5,537,610; previously cited and applied); Widergen et al. (Widergen; US 5,890,064; previously cited and applied); Eriksson (US 5,956,652; previously cited by the applicant and applied) or Sjodin et al. (Sjodin; US 5,995,843; previously cited by the applicant and applied) in view of Cripps (US 4,471,167; cited and applied for the first time).

Mauger or Widergen plainly teaches the claimed feature of providing PBX network functions to the remote devices where Mauger or Widergen clearly teaches the claimed first network as a PBX network and the claimed second network as a public

Application/Control Number: 09/593,541

Art Unit: 2642

Widergen is the PBX network.

The entire patent to Eriksson or Sjodin also plainly teaches the claimed feature of

providing PBX network functions to the remote devices where Eriksson or Sjodin clearly

teaches and depicts the claimed first network as a PBX network and the claimed

wireless carrier network. See the Abstract and Fig. 27 of Mauger. The PTN of

second network as a public wireless carrier network.

Mauger, Widergen, Eriksson, or Sjodin differs from claims 14-36 and 42-45 with

respect to the physical connection to a physical extension. However, the entire patent

to Cripps (refer inter alia to column 9 lines 6 – 66) is directed to plainly teaching the

advantages of a direct physical connection to a physical extension for a wireless device

without any changes to the central office. Therefore, it would have been obvious even

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the concept of

a physical connection to a physical extension as taught by Cripps into the system of

Mauger, Widergen, Eriksson, or Sjodin in order to provide dial tone function to the

wireless device with minimal modification.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9, 14, 18, 22, 28, 33, 37, 42, and

46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Harry S. Hong whose telephone number is (571) 272-

7485. The examiner is normally off on Wednesdays.

Application/Control Number: 09/593,541 Page 5

Art Unit: 2642

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on (571) 272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Harry S. Hong

Harry S. Hong Primary Examiner Art Unit 2642

March 13, 2006